

Response dated 03/08/2006  
Response to Office Action mailed 09/08/2005

Application No. 10/786,814

## REMARKS

### Drawings

Figures 4 and 6 have been amended and/or corrected. More particularly, the fastening mechanism for the middle panel 21 is defined as a combination of elements 90 and 92 now depicted in Figure 4 in phantom.

In Figure 6, Item 14B on the left hand side of this Figure has been corrected to be Item 14C.

### Claims

The claims have been amended to more succinctly set forth the subject matter of the invention. Briefly, the invention dual gate mouth bag. The bag is constructed essentially from three component parts including: (1) a bottom panel and (2) two substantially identical flexible fabric panels which form the sidewalls and the top wall or opening of the dual bag construction as well as an internal wall which separates the bag into two compartments. Figure 6 illustrates the pattern of the two substantially identical flexible component parts. The bottom panel 10 is illustrated in Figure 4.

Referring to Figure 6, the component parts of the substantially identical panel assemblies which form an internal wall comprise the panel sections 21 and 23. The opposite side walls are comprised of the panel sections 16 and 18. End walls are comprised of the sections 12 and 14. All of these elements are sewn together as described in the Specification to provide a dual gate mouth bag.

Claim 1 has been amended to obviate the objections pursuant to 35 USC 112. Claim 2 has been amended by deleting the reference to the sidewall fastening devices. Additionally the drawing has been amended to include the described features, namely the releasable fasteners 90 and 92. This conforms the text of the claim 2 as now submitted. New independent Claim 4 has been added.

The Examiner's rejected the claims based on the references to Adams, U.S. Patent No. 2,577,670 and Roth, U.S. Patent No. 2,332,757.

It is believed that the amended claims distinguish the subject matter of the invention from the prior art. Specifically, none of the references depict the concept of utilizing essentially three component parts to provide a dual gate mouth bag with an internal wall separating separate compartments within the bag. Nor, for example, is the feature of a releasable internal wall

Response dated 03/08/2006  
Response to Office Action mailed 09/08/2005

Application No. 10/786,814

depicted in the cited references. Perhaps most importantly, however, the utilization of a bottom panel which is sewn to two substantially identical flexible material panels forming the side walls and top of the dual gate mouth bag is completely different from the Adams and Roth construction. Adams for example, appears to utilize no separate bottom panel. Rather Adams folds a single fabric material into U-shape to form a bottom and two sides and then stitches additional material to the opposite sides of the panels forming the U.

The Roth construction provides for a multiple number of separately fabricated panels including side panels, a bottom panel and end panels all of which must be sewn together. The construction is therefore believed to be significantly different.

In view of the foregoing, therefore it is believed that the claims in their amended conditions are allowable. Reconsideration and passage to allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 8, 2006



Jon O. Nelson  
Registration No. 24,566  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
10 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 3000  
Chicago, IL 60606-7407  
Telephone: 312-463-5000  
Facsimile: 312-463-5001